



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,505	05/29/2001	Donald R. Katz	2541P001CD2	5909

8791 7590 06/14/2005

BLAKELY SOKOLOFF TAYLOR & ZAFMAN
12400 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD
SEVENTH FLOOR
LOS ANGELES, CA 90025-1030

EXAMINER

DINH, DUNG C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2152

DATE MAILED: 06/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/867,505

Applicant(s)

KATZ ET AL.

Examiner

Dung Dinh

Art Unit

2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 39-144 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 39-144 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2152

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/21/05 have been fully considered but they are deemed moot in view of new grounds of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2152

Claim 132-134, 137-138, 139-141, 144 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Brugger US patent 5,636,276. (prior art cited in IDS filed 6/18/01).

As per claim 132, Brugger teaches a computer based library system comprising:

a computer system [fig.1 Central Memory Device 2] connectable to a network (4), the computer system comprising targeting logic for generating targeted header (core) containing information indicative of a player ID corresponding to a particular player for rendering content [col.2 lines 1-15, col.4 lines 41-68], and downloading logic for downloading the targeted header with associated content to a player [col.5 45-50].

As per claim 133, Brugger teaches the ID correlate to a particular user [col.4 lines 59-60 consumer code].

As per claim 134, Brugger teaches the ID correlate to a particular player device [col.5 line 64-68 "identification of the consumer or of the terminal"].

As per claim 137, Brugger teaches the header contains a map for the associated content [col.4 lines 52-68].

As per claim 138, Brugger teaches the content is encrypted and the map comprises a key to decrypt the content [col.5 lines 51-59 encryption table].

Art Unit: 2152

As per claim 139, it is rejected under similar rationale as for claims 132 + 137 above.

As per claim 140, Brugger teaches the ID correlate to a particular user [col.4 lines 59-60 consumer code].

As per claim 141, Brugger teaches the ID correlate to a particular player device [col.5 line 64-68 "identification of the consumer or of the terminal"].

As per claim 144, Brugger teaches the content is encrypted and the map comprises a key to decrypt the content [col.5 lines 51-59 encryption table].

Claims 135-136, 142-143 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brugger US patent 5,636,276 and further in view of Munyan US patent 5,761,485.

As per claims 135-136, 142-143, Brugger does not teach the player being a mobile device. In similar field of invention of computer based library system, Munyan teaches the player being a mobile device with wireless connection (see fig.1). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teaching of Munyan with Brugger to provide a wireless mobile player device because it would have enabled the user to carry the device and viewed content on-the-go.

Art Unit: 2152

Claims 39-53, and 55-131, are rejected under 35

U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel et al. US patent 6,230,173 and further in view of Munyan US patent 5,761,485 and Brugger US patent 6,636,276.

As per claim 39, Ferrel an system for generating and maintain a plurality of digital information files for delivery over a public network, the system comprising:

an authoring system for receiving raw digital data and transforming said raw digitized data into the digital information files (col.6 lines 25-30, col.20 to col.24); and generating information indicative of various characteristics of content of said digital information files (col.21 lines 49-54); and

a library server coupled to the authoring system including logic for maintaining the digital information files (col.6 lines 46-62).

Ferrel does not teach maintaining correspondence to player ID information, encrypting the digital information files using the player ID information, and authorizing access to a user having a corresponding player ID.

In similar field of electronic content publishing, Munyan teaches to encode contents with each user's unique player ID (key) so that each user can only read files made for them; so as to discourage incentive to pirate copying of the files (Munyan col.14

Art Unit: 2152

lines 52-65). Also in similar field of electronic content publishing, Brugger teaches to encrypt the content at the library server prior to transmitting the content to the user device [col.5 lines 45-50] so as to prevent illegal copying or rerecording [col.2 lines 20-33].

Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Munyan and Brugger with Ferrel to have the library server maintain correspondence between digital file and player ID and to encrypt the files using the player ID prior to transmitting the content to the user because it would have improved the security of the content during transmission and reduced pirating of the digital information files once the user received the content.

As per claim 40, Ferrel teaches providing various multimedia files. It is apparent the Ferrel system as modified would have audio, image, text, video, etc. The type of files provided would have been clearly a matter of design choice. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to includes any of the various type files recited as appropriate to a publication project.

As per claims 41, Ferrel as modified has means for segmenting the digital information files (Ferrel fig.10), scrambling (encoding the file). Brugger specifically disclose compressing

Art Unit: 2152

prior to transmission [col.6 lines 20-24]. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to compress the files prior to transmission because it would have saved storage space and transmission bandwidth.

As per claim 42, Brugger teaches a descrambling map so as to enable the receiving system to decode the files (encryption table - see Brugger col.5 lines 51-55).

As per claim 43, Ferrel and Brugger teach incorporating characteristic information with the content (Ferrel col.22 lines 35-64, Brugger col.4 lines 53-68).

As per claim 44, it is apparent that Ferrel system as modified would have mean to manage and responsive to user request for delivery of the encoded digital information files in order to deliver files encoded corresponding the requesting user's player ID.

As per claim 45, Ferrel teaches to personalize and to provide billing for services (col.6 lines 9-11). Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to collect and store statistics of access history so as to enable billing and customization to the users' habit.

As per claim 46, the references do not specifically disclose an authentication server. Munyan discloses checking the validity of the user and security identification and to disconnect if

Art Unit: 2152

authentication is invalid (col.14 lines 60-65). Hence, it is apparent that Munyan would have had an authentication server to perform this function. Furthermore, the use of an authentication server is well known in the art for regulating access to content over a network. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide an authentication server because it would have enabled the system to regulate access the contents and improved the security of the system.

As per claim 47, Ferrel teaches running the library server on several computers (col.12 lines 51-60).

As per claims 48-49, it is apparent that Ferrel system as modified would have the authoring (publishing), library server (application server) and the authentication sever software running on different computers. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the have them run on different computers because it would have prevented a single point of failure and enabled the functions to be distributed at various points on the network.

As per claim 50, it is apparent that the Ferrel system as modified would 'target' the files using the player ID so as to uniquely encode the file for the targeted user.

As per claims 51-52, point-to-point authentication and digital signature authentication are well known security methods. The usage of either or both methods would have been a matter of

Art Unit: 2152

design choice. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use any number of known authentication methods, including point-to-point and digital signature, because the implementations are well-known and program logic for implement them are readily available.

As per claims 53, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 39 above.

As per claim 55, Ferrel teaches including files which are primarily textual content (col.23 lines 24-33).

As per claims 56-58, 59-71, 72-85, 86-99 they are rejected under similar rationale as for claims 39-52 above. Regarding claims 76-79, and 90-93, the types of ID recited to encode the contents are clearly obvious variation from the teaching of Munyan. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use any type of ID that can uniquely identify a set of users or devices so long as it can prevent playback on unauthorized device.

As per claims 110-120, they are rejected under similar rationale as for claim 39-52 above. Munyan teaches using a wireless client device for downloading and viewing the content (see Munyan fig.1). Regarding claims 115-118, the types of ID recited to encode the contents are clearly obvious variation from

Art Unit: 2152

the teaching of Munyan. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to use any type of ID that can uniquely identify a set of users or devices so long as it can prevent playback on unauthorized device.

As per claims 100-105, and 121-124, the various types of networks: wired, wireless, IR, telephone, etc. are well known in the art. The type of communication medium used would clearly have been a matter of design choice because the library system would operate essentially the same way regardless of the type of connection use.

As per claims 107-109, and 126-127, Ferrel teaches local library for local storage of programming content (col.12 lines 55-59).

As per claim 125, Munyan teaches using removable memory (col.14 lines 19-32).

As per claim 128-129, Brugger teaches descrambling logic and decompression logic in the player device in order to the player to decode the contents for playback (col.5 lines 51-55, col.6 lines 20-25).

As per claims 130-131, Ferrel teaches providing characteristic of the file so that contents can be search for. Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provider the playback device with capability to browse the

Art Unit: 2152

characteristic so as to enable the user to locate and request the desired contents.

Claim 54 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ferrel et al. US patent 6,230,173 and further in view of Munyan US patent 5,761,485, Brugger US patent 6,636,276 and Fernandez US patent 4,855,725.

As per claim 54, Ferrel an system for generating and maintain a plurality of digital information files for delivery over a public network, the system comprising:

a library server coupled to the authoring system including logic for maintaining the digital information files (col.6 lines 46-62). Ferrel does not teach maintaining correspondence to player ID information, encrypting the digital information files using the player ID information, and authorizing access to a user having a corresponding player ID and creating a CDROM.

In similar field of electronic content publishing, Munyan teaches to encode contents with each user's unique player ID (key) so that each user can only read files made for them; so as to discourage incentive to pirate copying of the files (Munyan col.14 lines 52-65). Also in similar field of electronic content publishing, Brugger teaches to encrypt the content at the library server prior to transmitting the content to the user device [col.5

Art Unit: 2152

lines 45-50] so as to prevent illegal copying or rerecording [col.2 lines 20-33]. Hence, one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to combine the teaching of Munyan and Brugger with Ferrel to have the library server maintain correspondence between digital file and player ID and to encrypt the files using the player ID prior to transmitting the content to the user because it would have improved the security of the content during transmission and reduced pirating of the digital information files once the user received the content.

Also in the field of electronic publishing, Fernadez teaches providing content on a CDROM that the user can download to and read on a portable device at the user leisure (see abstract).

Hence, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to provide contents on a CDROM because it would have enabled the user to quickly access to certain information without having to download it from the library server.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dung Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3943. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00 AM - 3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached at (571) 272-3949.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2152

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dung Dinh', with a long, sweeping horizontal stroke extending to the right.

Dung Dinh
Primary Examiner
June 8, 2005